arXiv:1602.03293v1 [math.AP] 10 Feb 2016

EXISTENCE AND REGULARITY OF SOURCE-TYPE SELF–SIMILAR SOLUTIONS FOR THE THIN-FILM EQUATION WITH GRAVITY

MOHAMED MAJDOUB & SLIM TAYACHI

Abstract. We investigate the existence and the boundary regularity of source-type self-similar solutions to the thin-film equation $h_t = -(h^n h_{zzz})_z + (h^{n+3})_{zz}$, $t > 0$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$; $h(0,z) = \omega\delta$ where $n \in (3/2, 3)$, $\omega > 0$ and δ is the Dirac mass at the origin. It is known that the leading order expansion near the edge of the support coincides with that of a travelling-wave solution for the standard thin-film equation: $h_t = -(h^n h_{zzz})_z$. In this paper we sharpen this result, proving that the higher order corrections are analytic with respect to three variables: the first one is just the spacial variable, whereas the second and third (except for $n = 2$) are irrational powers of it. It is known that this third order term does not appear for the thin-film equation without gravity.

Keywords: Fourth order degenerate parabolic equations, thin film equations, free boundary problems, self-similar solutions, source-type solutions, existence, regularity.

2000 AMS Classification: 35Q35, 35C06, 35K55, 35K65, 35B40, 35B65, 34B16, 34B10, 34B15.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Unfolding of the singularity 5
3. Well-posedness for the linear problem 7
4. Local existence 10
5. Regularity 14
Appendix A. Existence and uniqueness for ODE 22
Appendix B. Useful tools 23
3. Conclusions 24
Acknowledgements 25
References 25

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the existence and regularity of source-type self-similar solutions to the thin-film equation:

$$h_t + (h^n h_{zzz})_z = (h^{n+3})_{zz} \quad \text{for } t > 0 \text{ and } z \in (Z_-(t), Z_+(t)), \tag{1.1a}$$

$$h = h_z = 0 \quad \text{for } t > 0 \text{ and at } z = Z_\pm(t), \tag{1.1b}$$

$$\dot{Z}_\pm(t) = \lim_{z \to Z_\pm(t)} h^{n-1} h_{zzz} \quad \text{for } t > 0, \tag{1.1c}$$

$$h(0, z) = \omega \delta(z). \tag{1.1d}$$

The function $h = h(t, z) > 0$ describes the height or the thickness of a two-dimensional viscous thin film on a one-dimensional flat solid as a function of time $t > 0$ and the lateral variable z. The term $(h^{n+3})_{zz}$ represents the effect of the gravity. The plus sign in front of $(h^{n+3})_{zz}$ leads to a stabilizing term (droplet on the ground) as opposed to the droplet at the ceiling (destabilization). The functions $Z_\pm(t)$ define the boundary of the droplet, to which we refer to as contact lines due to their analog for three-dimensional films. Then condition $(1.1b)_1$ merely define the contact lines, whereas conditions $(1.1b)_2$ state that the contact angle between the liquid-gas and liquid-solid interfaces vanishes (commonly referred to as "complete wetting regime"). Condition (1.1c) is of kinematic character. It states that the (vertically averaged) velocity of the film $h^{n-1}h_{zzz}$ at the contact lines equals the contact line velocities. One then easily verifies that then the mass $\int_{Z_-(t)}^{Z_+(t)} h(t, z)\, \mathrm{d}z$ is a conserved quantity .

The source-type self-similar solutions of the standard thin film equation

$$h_t + (h^n h_{zzz})_z = 0 \tag{1.2}$$

has been studied by many authors, see [4] and references therein. In particular, the existence, uniqueness and the asymptotic behavior was established in [2]. Their asymptotic behavior result is refined in [4]. The result of [2] was extended to the thin film equation with gravity (1.1a) in [1], but without proving uniqueness and it is shown that the leading term is the same as for (1.2).

If h is a solution of (1.1a), then

$$h_\lambda(t, z) = \lambda h\left(\lambda^{n+4} t, \lambda z\right), \ \lambda > 0,$$

is a solution of (1.1a) on $\left(\lambda^{-1} Z_-(\lambda^{n+4}t), \lambda^{-1} Z_+(\lambda^{n+4}t)\right)$. Self-similar solutions are such that $h_\lambda \equiv h$, for all $\lambda > 0$. Taking $\lambda = t^{-\frac{1}{n+4}}$ we see that h is a self-similar solution if and only if

$$h(t, z) = t^{-\frac{1}{n+4}} \mathcal{H}\left(t^{-\frac{1}{n+4}} z\right), \quad Z_\pm(t) = t^{\frac{1}{n+4}} Z_\pm(1), \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathcal{H} := h(1,\cdot)$ is the profile of the self-similar solution. We look for regular profiles $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow [0,\infty)$ that are even and have compact support $[-a,a]$, $a > 0$, $\mathcal{H} > 0$ on $(-a,a)$ implying $Z_\pm(t) = \pm a t^{\frac{1}{n+4}}$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is even, $\mathcal{H}'(0) = 0$. By (1.1b) we have

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}' = 0 \text{ at } \pm a.$$

The conservation of mass, together with (1.3)-(1.1d), gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(t,z)dz = \int_{-a}^{a} \mathcal{H}(z)dz = \omega.$$

Since h satisfies equation (1.1a), $\mathcal{H}$ satisfies equation (1.4a) below, where we used (1.1c) after integration.

Hence, we have to look for pairs $(a,\mathcal{H})$ solving the problem

$$\mathcal{H}^n\mathcal{H}''' = \frac{1}{n+4} y\mathcal{H} + (n+3)\mathcal{H}^{n+2}\mathcal{H}' \quad \text{for } y \in (-a,a), \tag{1.4a}$$

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}' = 0 \quad \text{at } y = \pm a, \tag{1.4b}$$

$$\mathcal{H}(-y) = \mathcal{H}(y) > 0 \quad \text{on } (-a,a), \tag{1.4c}$$

$$\int_{-a}^{a} \mathcal{H}(y)\mathrm{d}y = \omega > 0. \tag{1.4d}$$

Clearly (1.4c) implies $\mathcal{H}'(0) = 0$. Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(y) = (n+4)^{\frac{1}{n}} a^{-\frac{4}{n}} \mathcal{H}(ay), \quad y \in (-1,1)$$

and

$$\mu = (n+3)(n+4)^{-\frac{2}{n}} a^{2+\frac{8}{n}}. \tag{1.5}$$

Then $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ solves the problem

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^n\tilde{\mathcal{H}}''' = y\tilde{\mathcal{H}} + \mu\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{n+2}\tilde{\mathcal{H}}' \quad \text{for } y \in (-1,1), \tag{1.6a}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}'(0) = 0,\ \tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}' = 0 \quad \text{at } y = \pm 1, \tag{1.6b}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(-y) = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(y) > 0 \quad \text{on } (-1,1), \tag{1.6c}$$

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(y)\mathrm{d}y = \frac{\sqrt{n+3}}{\sqrt{\mu}}\omega := \kappa(\mu) > 0. \tag{1.6d}$$

Let us apply the shift $y = -1 + x$ and put $H(x) = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(-1+x)$. Using the symmetry of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, the problem reduces to finding a pair $(\mu, H) \in (0,\infty) \times C^1\big([0,1]\big) \cap C^3\big((0,1)\big)$ such

that

$$H^{n-1}H''' = -1 + x + \mu H^{n+1}H', \quad x \in (0,1], \tag{1.7a}$$

$$H(0) = H'(0) = 0, \tag{1.7b}$$

$$H'(1) = 0, \tag{1.7c}$$

$$\int_0^1 H(y)\mathrm{d}y = \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\mu) > 0. \tag{1.7d}$$

As in [4], we denote by

$$H_{\mathrm{TW}}(x) := A^{-\frac{\nu}{3}}x^{\nu}, \forall\, x > 0, \tag{1.8}$$

a travelling wave profile to (1.2), i.e. a solution of

$$H_{\mathrm{TW}}^{n-1}H_{\mathrm{TW}}''' = -1, \quad x > 0, \tag{1.9a}$$

$$H_{\mathrm{TW}}(0) = H'_{\mathrm{TW}}(0) = 0, \tag{1.9b}$$

where

$$\nu := \frac{3}{n},\ A = \nu(\nu-1)(2-\nu). \tag{1.10}$$

Clearly, $n \in (3/2, 3)$ implies $\nu \in (1,2)$ and $A > 0$.

The travelling wave profile H_{TW} solves the leading order equation of (1.7a) for $x \ll 1$ (see Lemma 5.2). Therefore, the solution to (1.7) will have the same leading order asymptotic as $x \searrow 0$. The existence of solutions to (1.7) which behave like H_{TW} as $x \searrow 0$ is proved by Beretta. See [1, Theorem 5.1, p. 760].

Our aim is to prove the existence of solutions to (1.7) and give a more refined asymptotic than that of [1]. We now give the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $3/2 < n < 3$. Then we have the following:*

(i) There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $\mu > 0$ there exists a solution $H_\mu \in C^1\big([0,1]\big) \cap C^3\big((0,1)\big)$ of (1.7a)-(1.7b)-(1.7c) satisfying

$$H_\mu(x) = A^{-\frac{\nu}{3}}x^{\nu}\left(1 + \bar{u}\left(x, b(\mu)x^{\beta}, \mu x^{\gamma}\right)\right),\ 0 \le x \le \min\left\{\varepsilon^2, \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{b(\mu)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right\} \tag{1.11}$$

for some $b(\mu) > 0$, where $\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3) : [0,\varepsilon^2] \times [0,\varepsilon] \times [0,\varepsilon^2] \to \mathbb{R}$ is an analytic function with

$$\bar{u}(0,0,0) = 0,\ \partial_2\bar{u}(0,0,0) < 0,$$

and ν, A are given by (1.10) and

$$\beta := \frac{\sqrt{-3\nu^2 + 12\nu - 8} - 3\nu + 4}{2},\ \gamma := 2(1+\nu). \tag{1.12}$$

(ii) There exists $\bar{\mu} > 0$ such that the solution $H_{\bar{\mu}}$ satisfies also (1.7d).

Remark 1.1. Unlike [4], where by scaling argument we can reach any mass $\omega > 0$ from any given solution of (1.7a)-(1.7b)-(1.7c) without gravity, this is not possible in our case. This justify why we need Part (ii) in the previous theorem.

Remark 1.2. Although Beretta in [1] claims to prove existence of source type self-similar solutions for the equation with the minus sign in front of the gravity term(this is the droplet at the ceiling)

$$h_t = -(h^n h_{zzz})_z - (h^{n+3})_{zz},$$

for all positive mass ω, this is not the case as noted in [9, p.237] and [9, reference 6, p. 254]. See also [8, footnote, p.1711]. The mass ω should be less then the critical mass $\omega_c = 2\pi\sqrt{2/3}$.

The rest of this paper is devoted to the proof of the main result: Theorem 1.1. The proof of Theorem 1.1 mainly uses the method introduced in [4]. Our argument is based on a shooting method with respect to two parameters, unlike in [4] where the shooting is done only with respect to one parameter. Section 2 deals with the unfolding of the singularity in the three variables x, x^β, x^γ. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the related linear problem. In the forth section, we prove the local existence for the nonlinear problem. Section 5 is devoted to the shooting arguments in order to obtain the desired existence and regularity. In the sequel, C will be used to denote a constant which may vary from line to line. We also use $A \lesssim B$ to denote an estimate of the form $A \leq CB$ for some absolute constant C, $A \approx B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ and $A \ll B$ if A is sufficiently small with respect to B.

2. Unfolding of the singularity

As in [4], we factor off the leading order behavior $H_{\mathrm{TW}} = A^{-\frac{\nu}{3}} x^\nu$, i.e.

$$H(x) =: A^{-\frac{\nu}{3}} x^\nu F(x), \tag{2.1}$$

with

$$F(0) = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

Equation (1.7a) becomes

$$F^{n-1} q(D)F = A(-1+x) + \mu A^{-\frac{2\nu}{3}} x^{2\nu+2} F^{n+1}(D+\nu)F, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$D := x\partial_x, \tag{2.4}$$

and the polynomial q is given by

$$q(\xi) = (\xi+\nu)(\xi+\nu-1)(\xi+\nu-2). \tag{2.5}$$

Put

$$F(x) =: 1 + u(x).$$

Then since $q(D)1 = -A$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} F^{n-1}q(D)F &= (1+u)^{n-1}q(D)\big(1+u\big) \\ &= -A(1+u)^{n-1} + (1+u)^{n-1}q(D)u \\ &= -A - A[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1] + (1+u)^{n-1}q(D)u \\ &= -A - A\big[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1 - (n-1)u\big] + \big[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1\big]q(D)u \\ &\quad +q(D)u - (n-1)Au \\ &= -A - A\big[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1 - (n-1)u\big] + \big[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1\big]q(D)u \\ &\quad +p(D)u, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p(D)u = q(D)u - (n-1)Au. \tag{2.6}$$

Hence, using (2.5), the polynomial $p(\xi)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p(\xi) &= \xi^3 + 3(\nu-1)\xi^2 + (3\nu^2 - 6\nu + 2)\xi - 3(\nu-1)(2-\nu) && (2.7) \\ &= (\xi+1)(\xi-\alpha)(\xi-\beta) && (2.8) \end{aligned}$$

where β is given by (1.12) and α is given by

$$\alpha := \frac{-\sqrt{-3\nu^2 + 12\nu - 8} - 3\nu + 4}{2}. \tag{2.9}$$

Clearly since $n \in (3/2, 3)$, then $\alpha \in (-2, 0)$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$.

Problem (2.2)–(2.3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} p(D)u &= Ax + A\big[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1 - (n-1)u\big] \\ &\quad -\big[(1+u)^{n-1} - 1\big]q(D)u \\ &\quad +\mu A^{-\frac{2\nu}{3}} x^\gamma (1+u)^{n+1}(D+\nu)(1+u),\ x \in (0,1] && (2.10) \\ u(0) &= 0. && (2.11) \end{aligned}$$

We will study the corresponding linear problem

$$\begin{aligned} p(D)u &= f,\ x \in (0,1] && (2.12) \\ u(0) &= 0. && (2.13) \end{aligned}$$

For that purpose, we introduce a second and third variable

$$y := bx^\beta,\ z := \mu x^\gamma$$

for some $b \in \mathbb{R},\ \mu > 0$ to be fixed later. Let us explain the reason for that.

One cannot expect the solution $u(x)$ of (2.10) to be smooth in the single variable x, since this, together with boundary condition (2.11), rules out all homogeneous solutions x^{-1}, x^α, and x^β to the corresponding linear problem (2.12). Of these, the only one that is compatible with boundary condition (2.13) is the solution x^β. Note, however, that $\frac{\mathrm{d}^k}{\mathrm{d}x^k}x^\beta$ is singular in $x=0$ for $k\geq 1$ and so there can only be one solution $u(x)$ to (2.12) that is smooth with respect to the single variable x for smooth right-hand sides $f(x)$. Hence one introduces the artificial variable $y := bx^\beta$, being the only solution of (2.12) with $f\equiv 0$ that obeys (2.13).

One cannot expect the solution $u(x)$ to be a smooth function in the two variables x and x^β, since the right hand side of equation (2.10) is, for $n\neq 2$, not smooth in the two variables x and $y=bx^\beta$. This is why one introduces the artificial variable $z := \mu x^\gamma$.

If $v(x)$ and $\bar v(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma)$ are regular functions related via $v(x) = \bar v(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma)$ we have $Dv(x) = \bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar v(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma)$, where

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}} := x\partial_x + \beta y\partial_y + \gamma z\partial_z. \tag{2.14}$$

In order to unfold the singular behavior, we introduce also

$$u(x) = \bar u(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma).$$

The conditions $u(0)=0$ and $u(x)\sim -bx^\beta$ as $x\searrow 0$ and equation (2.12) translate to

$$\begin{aligned} p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar u &= \bar f, \quad \text{for } x>0,\ y>0,\ z>0, &(2.15)\\ \big(\bar u, \partial_y \bar u\big)(0,0,0) &= \big(0,-1\big). &(2.16)\end{aligned}$$

In fact equation (2.10) reads in the new variables

$$\begin{aligned} p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar u &= Ax + A\big[(1+\bar u)^{n-1} - 1 - (n-1)\bar u\big]\\ &\quad -\big[(1+\bar u)^{n-1}-1\big]q(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar u\\ &\quad +A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu} z(1+\bar u)^{n+1}(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu)(1+\bar u).\end{aligned}$$

Then the solution $\bar u(x,y,z)$ of (2.15)-(2.16) coincides with that of (2.10)-(2.11) in the case $y=\overline{b}x^\beta$, $z=\overline{\mu}x^\gamma$, for fixed values $(\overline{b},\overline{\mu})$, chosen such that condition (1.7c) as well as condition (1.7d) are fulfilled. The freedom to choose two real parameters b and μ will play a crucial role to fulfill two additional conditions.

3. Well-posedness for the linear problem

We introduce the notation $(x,y,z) =: (x_1,x_2,x_3)$, as well as $\partial_{x_i} := \partial_i$ for $i=1,\,2,\,3$. Let us set

$$\bar u =: \bar u_0 - x_2.$$

We will construct a solution to the linear problem with homogenous boundary condition:

$$p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar{u}_0 = \bar{f}, \quad \text{for } x_1>0,\ x_2>0,\ x_3>0, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\big(\bar{u}_0, \partial_2\bar{u}_0\big)(0,0,0) = \big(0,0\big). \tag{3.18}$$

A key tool in our construction will be the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\Lambda \leq \beta$, and consider the problem*

$$\big(\bar{\mathbf{D}} - \Lambda\big)\,\bar{u} = \bar{f}, \tag{3.19a}$$

$$\big(\bar{u}, \partial_2\bar{u}\big)(0,0,0) = \big(0,0\big). \tag{3.19b}$$

Then, for all smooth function $\bar{f}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ with $\big(\bar{f},\partial_2\bar{f}\big)(0,0,0)=\big(0,0\big)$, the function

$$\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \big(T_\Lambda\,\bar{f}\big)\,(x_1,x_2,x_3) := \int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda}\,\bar{f}(rx_1, r^\beta x_2, r^\gamma x_3)\,\frac{dr}{r}, \tag{3.20}$$

is a smooth solution of (3.19) *such that*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{1}\left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{\mathbf{D}}^j\bar{u}\right\| \lesssim \left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{f}\right\|, \quad (k,\ell,m)\in\mathbb{N}_0^3, \tag{3.21}$$

with $(k,\ell,m)\notin\{(0,0,0),\ (0,1,0)\}$ if $\Lambda=\beta$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the sup-norm on an arbitrary cuboid $[0,\ell_1]\times[0,\ell_2]\times[0,\ell_3]$. Moreover, we have the commutation property

$$T_\Lambda\bar{\mathbf{D}} = \bar{\mathbf{D}}T_\Lambda\,.$$

Proof. Although the proof is similar to that in [4, Lemma 1], we give it for completeness. Let us first show that formula (3.20) defines a smooth function satisfying (3.19b). Writing

$$\big|\big(T_\Lambda\,\bar{f}\big)\,(x_1,x_2,x_3)\big| \leq \big\|\bar{f}\big\|\int_0^1\frac{dr}{r^{1+\Lambda}},$$

we see that $\bar{u}$ is well defined for $\Lambda<0$. Assume now that $0\leq\Lambda\leq\beta$ and expanding

$$\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3) = rx_1\partial_1\bar{f}(0,0,0) + r^\gamma x_3\partial_3\bar{f}(0,0,0) + O_{(x_1,x_2,x_3)}(r^{2\beta}),$$

we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\big(T_\Lambda\,\bar{f}\big)\,(x_1,x_2,x_3)\big| &\leq \big\|x_1\partial_1\bar{f}(0,0,0)\big\|\int_0^1\frac{dr}{r^\Lambda} + \big\|x_3\partial_3\bar{f}(0,0,0)\big\|\int_0^1\frac{dr}{r^{\Lambda-\gamma}}\\ &+ C(x_1,x_2,x_3)\int_0^1\frac{dr}{r^{\Lambda-2\beta}} < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

The fact that $\partial_2\bar{f}(0,0,0)=0$ implies

$$\partial_2\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3) = O\left(rx_1 + r^\beta x_2 + r^\gamma x_3\right).$$

It follows that

$$\partial_2\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda+\beta}\,\partial_2\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\frac{dr}{r}, \tag{3.22}$$

is well defined. The boundary conditions (3.19b) follows from (3.20) and (3.22). To prove the smoothness, observe that

$$\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda+k+\ell\beta+m\gamma}\,\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\frac{dr}{r}\,.$$

Since $\Lambda \le \beta$ and the cases $(k,\ell,m) \in \{\,(0,0,0),\ (0,1,0)\}$ was handled, we conclude that the integral converges and the derivatives up to any order are well defined.

Recalling that

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}} = x_1\partial_1 + \beta x_2\partial_2 + \gamma x_3\partial_3,$$

we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar{u} &= \int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda}\Big[rx_1\partial_1\bar{f} + \beta r^\beta x_2\partial_2\bar{f} + \gamma r^\gamma x_3\partial_3\bar{f}\Big](rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\frac{dr}{r} \\
&= \int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda}\frac{d}{dr}\Big[\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\Big]\,dr \qquad (3.23)\\
&= \Big[r^{-\Lambda}\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\Big]_0^1 + \Lambda\int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda}\,\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\,\frac{dr}{r} \\
&= \bar{f}(x_1,x_2,x_3) + \Lambda\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\bar{f}(0,0,0) = \partial_2\bar{f}(0,0,0) = 0$ to deduce

$$r^{-\Lambda}\bar{f}(rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\Big|_{r=0} = 0\,.$$

We have by definition of T_Λ:

$$T_\Lambda\bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar{f} = \int_0^1 r^{-\Lambda}\Big[rx_1\partial_1\bar{f} + \beta r^\beta x_2\partial_2\bar{f} + \gamma r^\gamma x_3\partial_3\bar{f}\Big](rx_1,r^\beta x_2,r^\gamma x_3)\frac{dr}{r},$$

which is equal to $\bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar{u} = \bar{\mathbf{D}}T_\Lambda\bar{f}$ thanks to (3.23). Finally, (3.19b) is obvious and estimate (3.21) follows from the equation

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar{u} = \Lambda\bar{u} + \bar{f},$$

and the fact that

$$\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{u} = T_{\Lambda-k-\ell\beta-m\gamma}\,\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{f}\,.$$

□

A straightforward consequence of Lemma 3.1 is:

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a linear operator T such that for all smooth functions $\bar{f}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ with $(\bar{f},\partial_2\bar{f})(0,0,0)=(0,0)$, the function $\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3):=(T\bar{f})(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ is the unique smooth solution of (3.17)–(3.18). Furthermore, $\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ satisfies the estimates*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{3}\left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^l\partial_3^m\bar{\mathbf{D}}^j\bar{u}\right\|\lesssim\left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^l\partial_3^m\bar{f}\right\|,\ \forall\ (k,l,m)\in\mathbb{N}_0^3\setminus\{(0,0,0),\ (0,1,0)\}. \tag{3.24}$$

Proof. As in [4], we set

$$T:=T_\beta\,T_{-1}\,T_\alpha\,.$$

Hence, $\bar{u}:=T\bar{f}$ is well defined, smooth and satisfies the problem (3.19a)-(3.19b). The estimate (3.24) follows from Lemma 3.1. The uniqueness follows from (3.24) and Part a) of Lemma 4.1 below. □

4. Local existence

The unfolded function $\bar{u}(x,bx^\beta,\mu x^\gamma)$ (with $u(x)=\bar{u}(x,\overline{b}x^\beta,\overline{\mu}x^\gamma)$) shall satisfy the following boundary value problem

$$p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar{u}=\bar{f}_{\bar{u}},\quad\text{for }\ x_1,x_2,x_3>0, \tag{4.1a}$$

$$\big(\bar{u},\partial_2\bar{u}\big)(0,0,0)=\big(0,-1\big), \tag{4.1b}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{f}_{\bar{u}}\ &=\ Ax_1-\big((1+\bar{u})^{n-1}-1\big)\,q(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar{u}\\&\quad+A\left[(1+\bar{u})^{n-1}-1-(n-1)\bar{u}\right]\\&\quad+A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}x_3(1+\bar{u})^{n+1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu\right)(1+\bar{u})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The main result of this section is the following.

Proposition 4.1. *There exist $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$ and $\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ analytic in $[0,\varepsilon^2]\times[0,\varepsilon]\times[0,\varepsilon^2]:=Q_\varepsilon$ such that $\bar{u}$ solves (4.1) in Q_ε.*

The proof uses a fixed-point argument. In order to establish the contraction property, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\bar{f}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$, $\bar{g}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ be smooth. Then we have*

a) *if $\big(\bar{f},\partial_2\bar{f}\big)(0,0,0)=\big(0,0\big)$, then*

$$\|\bar{f}\|+\varepsilon\,\|\partial_2\bar{f}\|\lesssim\varepsilon^2\left(\|\partial_1\bar{f}\|+\|\partial_2^2\bar{f}\|+\|\partial_3\bar{f}\|\right).$$

b) $\big|\bar{f}\bar{g}\big|_0\le\big|\bar{f}\big|_0\,|\bar{g}|_0$, *where, for $K,L,M\in\mathbb{N}$,*

$$|\bar{h}|_0=\sum_{k=0}^{K}\sum_{\ell=0}^{L}\sum_{m=0}^{M}\frac{\varepsilon^{2k+\ell+2m}}{k!\ell!m!}\left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{h}\right\|,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the sup-norm on Q_ε.

Proof. Part a) of the lemma follows immediately from the following representations:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar f(x_1,x_2,x_3) &= \int_0^{x_2}\int_0^s \partial_2^2\bar f(0,\tau,0)d\tau ds + \int_0^{x_1}\partial_1\bar f(s,x_2,0)ds\\ &\quad + \int_0^{x_3}\partial_3\bar f(x_1,x_2,s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon\partial_2\bar f(x_1,x_2,x_3) &= \bar f(x_1,\varepsilon,x_3) - \bar f(x_1,0,x_3) + \int_0^{x_2}\tau\partial_2^2\bar f(x_1,\tau,x_3)d\tau\\ &\quad - \int_{x_2}^{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon-\tau)\partial_2^2\bar f(x_1,\tau,x_3)d\tau.\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to the proof of Part b). By Leibniz formula, we have

$$\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\left(\bar f\bar g\right) = \sum_{k'=0}^{k}\sum_{\ell'=0}^{\ell}\sum_{m'=0}^{m}\frac{k!\ell!m![\partial_1^{k'}\partial_2^{\ell'}\partial_3^{m'}\bar f][\partial_1^{k-k'}\partial_2^{\ell-\ell'}\partial_3^{m-m'}\bar g]}{(k-k')!(\ell-\ell')!(m-m')!k'!\ell'!m'!}.$$

Using the fact that $\|uv\|\le\|u\|\,\|v\|$, we deduce

$$\left|\bar f\bar g\right|_0 \le \sum_{k=0}^{K}\sum_{\ell=0}^{L}\sum_{m=0}^{M}\sum_{k'=0}^{K}\sum_{\ell'=0}^{L}\sum_{m'=0}^{M} a_{k',\ell',m'}\,b_{k-k',\ell-\ell',m-m'},$$

where

$$a_{k',\ell',m'} = \frac{\varepsilon^{2k'+\ell'+2m'}}{k'!\ell'!m'!}\left\|\partial_1^{k'}\partial_2^{\ell'}\partial_3^{m'}\bar f\right\|,$$

$$b_{k-k',\ell-\ell',m-m'} = \frac{\varepsilon^{2(k-k')+(\ell-\ell')+2(m-m')}}{(k-k')!(\ell-\ell')!(m-m')!}\left\|\partial_1^{k-k'}\partial_2^{\ell-\ell'}\partial_3^{m-m'}\bar g\right\|.$$

Hence

$$\left|\bar f\bar g\right|_0 \le \left(\sum_{k=0}^{K}\sum_{\ell=0}^{L}\sum_{m=0}^{M}a_{k,\ell,m}\right)\left(\sum_{k=0}^{K}\sum_{\ell=0}^{L}\sum_{m=0}^{M}b_{k,\ell,m}\right).$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

We will need the following result for the fixed-point argument:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\bar f$ be a smooth function satisfying $\big(\bar f,\partial_2\bar f\big)(0,0,0)=\big(0,0\big)$. Let $\bar u = T\bar f$ be the solution of*

$$\begin{aligned}p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar u &= \bar f,\\ \big(\bar u,\partial_2\bar u\big)(0,0,0) &= \big(0,0\big),\end{aligned}$$

given by Proposition 3.1. Then we have

$$|\bar u|_1 = \left|T\bar f\right|_1 \lesssim \left|\bar f\right|_0.$$

Proof. Since $\big(\bar{\mathbf{D}}^j\bar{u}, \partial_2\bar{\mathbf{D}}^j\bar{u}\big)(0,0,0) = \big(0,0\big)$, we obtain by part a) of Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 3.1

$$\begin{aligned}|\bar{u}|_1 &\lesssim \sum_{(k,\ell,m)\notin\{(0,0,0),(0,1,0)\}} \frac{\varepsilon^{2k+\ell+2m}}{k!\ell!m!}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{3}\left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{\mathbf{D}}^j\bar{u}\right\|\right)\\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{K}\sum_{\ell=0}^{L}\sum_{m=0}^{M}\frac{\varepsilon^{2k+\ell+2m}}{k!\ell!m!}\left\|\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar{f}\right\| = |\bar{f}|_0\end{aligned}$$

□

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We write $\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3) =: -x_2 + \bar{u_0}(x_1,x_2,x_3)$, and rewrite (4.1a)-(4.1b) in the equivalent formulation:

$$p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar{u_0} = \bar{f}_{\bar{u}}, \quad \text{for } x_1,x_1,x_3>0, \tag{4.3a}$$

$$\big(\bar{u_0},\partial_2\bar{u_0}\big)(0,0,0) = \big(0,0\big), \tag{4.3b}$$

where $\bar{f}_{\bar{u}}$ is given by (4.2). For K,L,M fixed integers, let

$$\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M} := \Big\{\,\bar{v}\in C^{K+L+M+3}(Q_\varepsilon);\quad (\bar{v},\partial_2\bar{v})(0,0,0)=(0,0)\ \text{ and }\ \tilde{|\bar{v}|}_1\le\varepsilon\Big\},$$

where

$$\tilde{|\bar{v}|}_1 := |\bar{v}|_1 + \sum_{\substack{\alpha=(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)\\ |\alpha|=K+L+M+3}}\frac{\varepsilon^{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\alpha_3}}{\alpha_1!\alpha_2!\alpha_3!}\|\partial^\alpha\bar{v}\|\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $\Big(C^{K+L+M+3}(Q_\varepsilon),\tilde{|\cdot|}_1\Big)$ is a Banach space, it follows that $\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M}$ is a complete metric space. Note that if $\bar{u}\in\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M}$ then (see [4])

$$(\bar{f}_{\bar{u}},\partial_2\bar{f}_{\bar{u}})(0,0,0) = (0,0)\,.$$

Hence the operator T given by Proposition 3.1 is well defined, and we obtain a fixed point equation :

$$\bar{u} = -x_2 + T\bar{f}_{\bar{u}} := \mathcal{T}(\bar{u})\,.$$

To conclude we will show that $\mathcal{T}$ is a contraction from $\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M}$ into itself. Therefore one has to prove the estimates

$$\tilde{|\mathcal{T}(\bar{u})-\mathcal{T}(\bar{v})|}_1 \lesssim \varepsilon\tilde{|\bar{u}-\bar{v}|}_1 \quad \text{for all } \bar{u},\bar{v}\in\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M} \tag{4.5a}$$

and

$$\tilde{|\mathcal{T}(\bar{u})|}_1 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \quad \text{for all } \bar{u}\in\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M} \tag{4.5b}$$

and then choose $\varepsilon>0$ sufficiently small. The proof is the same as in [4] by using Lemmas 4.1-4.2 and [4, Lemma 4] (for smooth functions with three variables), namely

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\bar f(x_1,x_2,x_3)$, $\bar g(x_1,x_2,x_3)$ be smooth functions with $|\bar f\tilde|_0$, $|\bar g\tilde|_0 \le 1/2$. Then we have, for any $m\in\mathbb{R}$:*

$$\left|(1+\bar f)^m-1\right|\tilde{}_0 \lesssim_m |\bar f\tilde|_0, \tag{4.6a}$$

$$|(1+\bar f)^m-(1+\bar g)^m\tilde|_0 \lesssim_m |\bar f-\bar g\tilde|_0, \tag{4.6b}$$

$$|(1+\bar f)^m-m\bar f-(1+\bar g)^m+m\bar g\tilde|_0 \lesssim_m \max\{|\bar f\tilde|_0,\ |\bar g\tilde|_0\}|\bar f-\bar g\tilde|_0, \tag{4.6c}$$

where

$$|\bar v\tilde|_0 := |\bar v|_0 + \sum_{\substack{\alpha=(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)\\ |\alpha|=K+L+M+3}} \frac{\varepsilon^{2\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\alpha_3}}{\alpha_1!\alpha_2!\alpha_3!}\|\partial^\alpha \bar v\|\,. \tag{4.7}$$

The proof of this lemma is the same as in [4], i.e. that it uses the series expansion of the fractional power and the submultiplicativity of the norm $|\cdot\tilde|_0$. We use Lemma 4.2 to conclude $|\mathcal{T}(\bar u)-\mathcal{T}(\bar v)\tilde|_1 \lesssim |\bar f_{\bar u}-\bar f_{\bar v}\tilde|_0$ as well as $|\mathcal{T}(\bar u)\tilde|_1 \lesssim |\bar f_{\bar u}\tilde|_0$ and that (4.5) can now be established by using Lemma 4.3. This has been mainly done in [4] and we only treat the additional appearing terms in $\bar f_{\bar u}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}|A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}x_3(1+\bar u)^{n+1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu\right)(1+\bar u)\tilde|_0 \quad &\lesssim \quad |x_3\tilde|_0|(1+\bar u)^{n+1}\tilde|_0\left(|\bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar u\tilde|_0+|\bar u\tilde|_0+1\right)\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^2,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{gathered}|A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}x_3\left[(1+\bar u)^{n+1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu\right)(1+\bar u)-(1+\bar v)^{n+1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu\right)(1+\bar v)\right]\tilde|_0\lesssim\\ \varepsilon^2\Big[|(1+\bar u)^{n+1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu\right)(\bar u-\bar v)\tilde|_0+|\left((1+\bar u)^{n+1}-(1+\bar v)^{n+1}\right)\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu\right)(1+\bar v)\tilde|_0\Big]\lesssim\\ \varepsilon^2\left[|(1+\bar u)^{n+1}\tilde|_0|\bar u-\bar v\tilde|_1+|(1+\bar u)^{n+1}-(1+\bar v)^{n+1}\tilde|_0\right]\lesssim\\ \varepsilon^2|\bar u-\bar v\tilde|_1\,.\end{gathered}$$

Since the sets $\mathbf{S}_{K,L,M}$ are nested as K,L,M increase, the fixed point $\bar u_0$ is C^∞ and the Taylor series

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\frac{\partial_1^k\partial_2^\ell\partial_3^m\bar u_0(0,0,0)}{k!\ell!m!}x_1^kx_2^\ell x_3^m,$$

converges absolutely in Q_ε. Moreover the corresponding error terms converge uniformly to zero, then the Taylor series also represents the solution, i.e. the solution is analytic. This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.1. □

Remark 4.1. The result of Proposition 4.1 still valid if we replace Q_ε by $\tilde Q_\varepsilon = [-\varepsilon^2,\varepsilon^2]\times[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]\times[-\varepsilon^2,\varepsilon^2]$ for $(b,\mu)\in\mathbb{R}^2$.

5. Regularity

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. Until now, we have constructed a solution of (1.7a) and (1.7b)

$$H_{b,\mu}(x) = A^{-\frac{\nu}{3}} x^{\nu}(1 + u_{b,\mu}(x)), \tag{5.1}$$

with

$$\nu = \frac{3}{n},\ A = \nu(\nu-1)(2-\nu), \quad \text{and} \quad u_{b,\mu}(x) = \bar{u}\left(x, bx^{\beta}, \mu x^{\gamma}\right),$$

where $\bar{u}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is given by Proposition 4.1. In particular, $\bar{u}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is analytic in $Q_\varepsilon = [0, \varepsilon^2] \times [0, \varepsilon] \times [0, \varepsilon^2]$. Then $u_{b,\mu}$, hence $H_{b,\mu}$ are defined for

$$0 \le x \le \hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon) := \min\left\{\varepsilon^2, \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{b}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

We first give the following existence and uniqueness result.

Lemma 5.1. *Consider the initial value problem*

$$U''' = (x-1)U^{1-n} + \mu U^2 U', \tag{5.3a}$$

$$U(x_0) = U_0 > 0,\ U'(x_0) = U_1 \in \mathbb{R},\ U''(x_0) = U_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{5.3b}$$

where $n > 1,\ \mu > 0,\ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a unique maximal solution $U = U(x) > 0$ of (5.3), defined on some interval (x_*, x^*) with $-\infty \le x_* < x_0 < x^* \le \infty$.

The proof of this lemma is postponed to the Appendix A. As an application of Lemma 5.1 we have

Proposition 5.1. *The function $H_{b,\mu}$ given in (5.1) can be extended to a smooth solution of (1.7a)-(1.7b) on a maximal interval $(0, x^*_{b,\mu})$ with*

$$H_{b,\mu} > 0 \text{ in } (0, x^*_{b,\mu}) \ \text{ and } \ x^*_{b,\mu} \le \infty. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Let $U = H_{b,\mu},\ x_0 = \frac{1}{2}\hat{x}_{b,\mu}$ where $H_{b,\mu}$ is given by (5.1) and $\hat{x}_{b,\mu}$ is given by (5.2). Since $H_{b,\mu}$ satisfies (5.3a) on $(0, \hat{x}_{b,\mu})$ and $H_{b,\mu}(0) = 0$, then U satisfies (5.3a)-(5.3b) with $U(x_0) = H_{b,\mu}(x_0) > 0,\ U'(x_0) = H'_{b,\mu}(x_0),\ U''(x_0) = H''_{b,\mu}(x_0)$. By Lemma 5.1, $U = H_{b,\mu}$ can be extended to a smooth solution of (1.7a)-(1.7b) on a maximal interval $(0, x^*_{b,\mu})$. □

Our goal is to show the existence of a solution satisfying (1.7c) and (1.7d) as well. To fulfill condition (1.7c) we shoot with the parameter b. Thus, we obtain a solution $H_{\overline{b}(\mu),\mu}$ of (1.7a) which satisfies (1.7b) and (1.7c). We conclude by a shooting argument with μ to fulfill condition (1.7d). For both, the following expansions are essential:

Lemma 5.2. *Let H_{TW} be the travelling wave solution of (1.9) given by (1.8), and $H_{b,\mu}$ the function defined by equation (5.1). There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that the following holds.*

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x^k(H_{b,\mu} - H_{\mathrm{TW}})(x) &= \frac{A^{1-\nu/3}}{p(1)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+1} - bA^{-\nu/3}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+\beta} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu\nu A^{-\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+\gamma}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

$$\partial_x^k \partial_b H_{b,\mu}(x) = -A^{-\nu/3}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+\beta}, \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$\partial_x^k \partial_\mu H_{b,\mu}(x) = \frac{\nu A^{-\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+\gamma}, \tag{5.7}$$

for $k \in \{0,1,2,3\}$, $0 \le \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$ and $0 \le x \le \hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon)$.

We point out that $O(\varepsilon)$ means a generic function $f(x,\varepsilon)$ with $|f(x,\varepsilon)| \lesssim \varepsilon$ for x near 0.

Proof. We have that $(H_{b,\mu} - H_{\mathrm{TW}})(x) = A^{-\nu/3}x^\nu u_{b,\mu}(x)$, where $u_{b,\mu}(x) = \bar{u}(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma)$. Since $\bar{u}$ satisfies the equations (4.1a)-(4.1b)-(4.2), and using the fact that $\partial_1 p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar{u} = p(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+1)\partial_1\bar{u}$ and $\partial_3 p(\bar{\mathbf{D}})\bar{u} = p(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\gamma)\partial_3\bar{u}$ we get

$$\partial_1\bar{u}(0,0,0) = \frac{A}{p(1)} > 0, \quad \partial_3\bar{u}(0,0,0) = \frac{\nu A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)} > 0\,.$$

Hence

$$\bar{u}(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \frac{A}{p(1)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_1 - \big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_2 + \frac{\nu A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_3. \tag{5.8}$$

By definition of $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$, we have that

$$\partial_x^k\left(x^\nu u_{b,\mu}(x)\right) = x^{\nu-k}\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu-j\right)\bar{u}(x,bx^\beta,\mu x^\gamma). \tag{5.9}$$

We also have

$$\partial_b u_{b,\mu}(x) = \frac{1}{b}x_2\partial_2\bar{u}(x,bx^\beta,\mu x^\gamma), \tag{5.10a}$$

$$\partial_\mu u_{b,\mu}(x) = \frac{1}{\mu}x_3\partial_3\bar{u}(x,bx^\beta,\mu x^\gamma). \tag{5.10b}$$

The analyticity of $\bar{u}$ and (5.8) imply

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}}^k\bar{u} = \frac{A}{p(1)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_1 - \beta^k\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_2 + \gamma^k\frac{\nu A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_3, \tag{5.11a}$$

$$x_2\partial_2\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}^k\bar{u}\right) = -\beta^k\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_2, \tag{5.11b}$$

$$x_3\partial_3\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}^k\bar{u}\right) = \gamma^k\frac{\nu A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x_3. \tag{5.11c}$$

It follows from (5.8)-(5.9) and $Du_{b,\mu}(x) = \bar{\mathbf{D}}\bar{u}(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_x^k(H_{b,\mu} - H_{\mathrm{TW}})(x) &= \partial_x^k A^{-\nu/3}x^\nu u_{b,\mu}(x)\\
&= A^{-\nu/3}x^{\nu-k}\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(\bar{\mathbf{D}}+\nu-j\right)\bar{u}(x, bx^\beta, \mu x^\gamma)\\
&= A^{-\nu/3}x^{\nu-k}\prod_{j=0}^{k-1}\left(\mathbf{D}+\nu-j\right)\Big(\frac{A}{p(1)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x\\
&\quad -b\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x^\beta + \frac{\mu\nu A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x^\gamma\Big)\\
&= A^{-\nu/3}\partial_x^k x^\nu\Big(\frac{A}{p(1)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x - b\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x^\beta\\
&\quad +\frac{\mu\nu A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)x^\gamma\Big)\\
&= \frac{A^{1-\nu/3}}{p(1)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+1} - bA^{-\nu/3}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+\beta}\\
&\quad +\frac{\mu\nu A^{-\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\big(1+O(\varepsilon)\big)\partial_x^k x^{\nu+\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (5.5). We easily deduce from (5.5), the formulas (5.6) and (5.7). □

In the following Lemma and Proposition, μ is assumed to be a fixed positive real number. A key lemma is the following:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mu > 0$ be fixed and H_{TW} be the travelling wave solution of* (1.9) *given by* (1.8). *The function $H_{b,\mu}$ defined by equation* (5.1) *satisfies:*

(i) $\partial_x^k H_{0,\mu}(x) > \partial_x^k H_{\mathrm{TW}}(x)$ *for* $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ *and* $x \in (0, x^*_{0,\mu})$. *In particular $H_{0,\mu}$ does not reache* 0.

(ii) $\partial_b\partial_x^k H_{b,\mu}(x) \le 0$ *for* $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ *and* $x \in [0, \hat{x}_{b,\mu})$.

(iii) $x^*_{b,\mu} \to 0$ *as* $b \to \infty$.

Proof. From (5.5) we have, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small that

$$\partial_x^k H_{0,\mu} > \partial_x^k H_{\mathrm{TW}} \quad \text{on} \quad (0, \hat{x}_{0,\mu}(\varepsilon)] \quad \text{for} \quad k = 0, 1, 2. \tag{5.12}$$

From equations (1.7a)-(1.9a) and the fact that $\mu > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(H_{0,\mu} - H_{\rm TW})''' &= \frac{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} - H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}}{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \frac{x}{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1}} + \mu H_{0,\mu}^2 H_{0,\mu}' \\
&> \frac{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} - H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}}{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \mu H_{0,\mu}^2 H_{0,\mu}' \\
&> \frac{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} - H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}}{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} H_{\rm TW}^{n-1} (H_{0,\mu} - H_{\rm TW})} (H_{0,\mu} - H_{\rm TW}) \\
&+ \mu H_{0,\mu}^2 (H_{0,\mu} - H_{\rm TW})'. \qquad (5.13)
\end{aligned}$$

The first assertion (i) follows from (5.12), (5.13) and Corollary B.1.

We now turn to the proof of (ii). From (5.6) we have, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small that

$$\partial_b \partial_x^k H_{b,\mu} < 0 \quad \text{on} \quad (0, \hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon)] \quad \text{for} \quad k = 0, 1, 2. \qquad (5.14)$$

Differentiation of equation (1.7a) with respect to b yields

$$G''' = \frac{(n-1)(1-x)}{H^n} G + 2\mu H H' G + \mu H^2 G', \qquad (5.15)$$

where $G = \partial_b H$ and $H = H_{b,\mu}$. By (5.5) the coefficients in the previous equation on G are positive. The assertion (ii) follows by the ordering (5.14), the equation (5.15) and Corollary B.2.

Finally we turn to prove (iii). For $b \geq \max\left(\varepsilon^{1-2\beta}, \mu^{\beta/\gamma}\varepsilon^{1-2\beta/\gamma}\right)$, we have $\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon) = (\varepsilon/b)^{1/\beta}$. Hence, it follows from the expansion (5.5) with b sufficiently large, and the fact that $\beta < 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{b,\mu} - H_{\rm TW} &\leq 0 \\
(H_{b,\mu} - H_{\rm TW})' &\leq 0 \qquad (5.16) \\
(H_{b,\mu} - H_{\rm TW})'' &\lesssim -b^{\frac{2-\nu}{\beta}} \varepsilon^{1+\frac{\nu-2}{\beta}}
\end{aligned}$$

at $x = (\varepsilon/b)^{1/\beta}$. Also, using the monotonicity in b, we obtain for $x \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(H_{b,\mu} - H_{\rm TW})''' &= \frac{-1+x}{H_{b,\mu}^{n-1}} + \frac{1}{H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \mu H_{b,\mu}^2 H_{b,\mu}' \\
&\leq \frac{-1+x}{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1}} + \frac{1}{H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \mu H_{b,\mu}^2 H_{b,\mu}' \\
&\leq (1-x)\frac{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} - H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}}{H_{0,\mu}^{n-1} H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \frac{x}{H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \mu H_{b,\mu}^2 H_{b,\mu}' \\
&\leq (n-1)(1-x)\frac{H_{0,\mu} - H_{\rm TW}}{H_{\rm TW}^{n}} + \frac{x}{H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} + \mu H_{b,\mu}^2 H_{b,\mu}',
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (i) with $k=0$ and the inequality

$$\frac{X^\alpha - Y^\alpha}{(XY)^\alpha} \leq \frac{\alpha}{Y^{\alpha+1}}(X-Y), \quad \alpha>0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0<Y<X.$$

By (1.8), (5.1) and (5.8), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-x)\frac{H_{0,\mu}-H_{\rm TW}}{H_{\rm TW}^n} &\sim \frac{x^{\nu+1}}{x^{n\nu}} = x^{\nu-2} \quad \text{as} \quad x \searrow 0,\\
\frac{x}{H_{\rm TW}^{n-1}} &\sim \frac{x}{x^{(n-1)\nu}} = x^{\nu-2} \quad \text{as} \quad x \searrow 0,\\
H_{b,\mu}^2 H_{b,\mu}' &\sim x^{3\nu-1} = o(x^{\nu-2}) \quad \text{as} \quad x \searrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and since $(H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})'''$ is regular for $x>0$, we conclude that

$$(H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})''' \lesssim x^{\nu-2}, \tag{5.17}$$

for $x \in \left((\varepsilon/b)^{1/\beta}, \min\{1, x_{b,\mu}^*\}\right)$, $b \geq \max\left(\varepsilon^{1-2\beta}, \mu^{\beta/\gamma}\varepsilon^{1-(2\beta/\gamma)}\right)$.

The Taylor expansion of $H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW}$ around $\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon)$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}
(H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})(x) &= (H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})(\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon))\\
&+ (x-\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon))(H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})'(\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon))\\
&+ \frac{1}{2}(x-\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon))^2(H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})''(\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon))\\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon)}^x (x-y)^2(H_{b,\mu}-H_{\rm TW})'''(y)\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (5.16) and (5.17) for $x \geq \hat{x}_{b,\mu}$ close to $\hat{x}_{b,\mu}$, we get

$$H_{b,\mu}(x) \leq H_{\rm TW}(x) - c_1 b^{\frac{2-\nu}{\beta}}\varepsilon^{1+\frac{\nu-2}{\beta}}(x-\hat{x}_{b,\mu}(\varepsilon))^2 + c_2 x^{\nu+1}.$$

It follows, since $\nu<2$, that for b sufficiently large, the right hand side of the previous inequality is negative. This completes the proof of Part (iii). This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

A consequence of the previous lemma is:

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mu>0$ be fixed. Then there exists $\bar{b}(\mu)>0$ such that the function $H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ satisfies* (1.7a)–(1.7c). *Moreover, $H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}>0$ on $(0,1)$.*

Proof. We have $H'_{b,\mu}(x)>0$ for x near 0 by (5.5), and, for b sufficiency large, $H'_{b,\mu}$ is negative somewhere by Lemma 5.3 Part (iii). Hence, there exists $\bar{x}_{b,\mu}$ such that $H'_{b,\mu}(\bar{x}_{b,\mu})=0$. Define

$$\mathcal{B} = \Big\{\, b>0;\ \ H'_{b,\mu}(x)=0 \quad \text{for some} \quad x \in (0,1]\cap(0,x_{b,\mu}^*) \,\Big\}.$$

Let $\bar{b}(\mu)=\inf\mathcal{B}$ which is well defined. Part (i) of Lemma 5.3 ensures that $\bar{b}(\mu)>0$. Moreover, by continuous dependence on the parameter b, $\bar{b}(\mu)\in\mathcal{B}$.

To conclude we will prove that $\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)} = 1$, where for $b \in \mathcal{B}$, $\bar{\bar{x}}_b$ stands for the first zero of $H'_{b,\mu}$. Assume by contradiction that $\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)} < 1$. Then, since $H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}) = 0$, we get $H'''_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}) = (-1+\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)})H^{1-n}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}) < 0$. Hence $H'''_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} < 0$ in some neighborhood of $\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}$ and $H''_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ is decreasing. Moreover, the fact that $H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}) = 0$ and $H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} > 0$ on $(0, \bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)})$ implies that $H''_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}) \le 0$. Using the fact that $H''_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ is decreasing, we deduce that

$$H''_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} < 0, \text{ on } (\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}, \bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)} + \eta),$$

for some $\eta > 0$. Then

$$H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} < 0, \text{ on } (\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)}, \bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)} + \eta).$$

This contradicts the definition of $\bar{b}(\mu)$ and proves that $\bar{\bar{x}}_{\bar{b}(\mu)} = 1$. It follows that $H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ is the desired solution satisfying (1.7a)-(1.7b)-(1.7c). □

Proposition 5.3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for $\mu > 0$ sufficiently large, we have*

$$\int_0^1 H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)dx \ge C \left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)^{\nu}, \tag{5.18}$$

where $\hat{x}_{b,\mu}$ is given by (5.2).

Proof. We claim that there exists a constant $C_\varepsilon > 0$ (depending only on ε) such that

$$H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x) \;\ge\; C_\varepsilon\, A^{-\nu/3}\, x^{\nu}, \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le x \le \hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\,. \tag{5.19}$$

Indeed, by (5.1) and (5.8), we have

$$H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x) = A^{-\nu/3}\, x^{\nu}\Big[1 + (1 + O(\varepsilon))\;\, g(x)\Big],$$

where

$$g(x) = \frac{A}{p(1)}x - \bar{b}(\mu)x^{\beta} + \frac{A^{-\frac{2}{3}\nu}}{p(\gamma)}\;\nu\mu x^{\gamma}\,.$$

Since for $0 \le x \le \hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\left(\le \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{b}(\mu)}\right)^{1/\beta}\right)$; we have $\varepsilon - \bar{b}(\mu)x^{\beta} \ge 0$, then

$$g(x) \ge -\varepsilon, \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le x \le \hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\,.$$

It follows that, for ε sufficiently small,

$$1 + (1 + O(\varepsilon))\;\, g(x) \ge 1 - 2\varepsilon\,.$$

Hence we obtain (5.19) with $C_\varepsilon := 1 - 2\varepsilon$. Then, since $H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ is increasing

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)\,dx &\geq \int_{\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}}^1 H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)\,dx \\ &\geq \left(1-\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)\, H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right) \\ &\geq (1-2\varepsilon)\,A^{-\nu/3}\left(1-\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)\left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)^{\nu} \\ &\geq \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2}\,A^{-\nu/3}\,\left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)^{\nu},\end{aligned}$$

for μ sufficiently large. □

Proposition 5.4. *There exists $\bar{\mu} > 0$ such that $H_{\bar{b}(\bar{\mu}),\bar{\mu}}$ satisfies* (1.7d)*, namely*

$$\int_0^1 H_{\bar{b}(\bar{\mu}),\bar{\mu}}(x)dx = \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\bar{\mu}) = \frac{\sqrt{n+3}}{2\sqrt{\bar{\mu}}}\omega,$$

where ω is fixed by (1.1d)*.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the map

$$\omega : 0 \leq \mu \longmapsto \omega(\mu) = \frac{2\sqrt{\mu}}{\sqrt{n+3}}\int_0^1 H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)dx$$

satisfies $\omega([0,\infty)) = [0,\infty)$. Indeed, ω is continuous with respect to μ and $\omega(0) = 0$. We argue by contradiction by assuming that there exists $\omega^* > 0$ such that

$$\omega(\mu) \leq \omega^*, \quad \forall\ \mu \geq 0.$$

Then, by Proposition 5.3 we get

$$C\left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)^{\nu} \leq \omega^*\mu^{-1/2}\,. \tag{5.20}$$

It is clear that, for μ sufficiently large, we can have neither $C\varepsilon^2 \leq \omega^*\mu^{-1/2}$ nor $C\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\mu}\right)^{1/\gamma} \leq \omega^*\mu^{-1/2}$. Since $\gamma > 2$, it follows that for μ large, and by (5.2), (5.20), we should have

$$\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{b}(\mu)}\right)^{1/\beta}. \tag{5.21}$$

Plugging (5.21) in (5.20), we obtain

$$\bar{b}(\mu) \gtrsim \varepsilon\mu^{\beta/2\nu}, \tag{5.22}$$

which implies, using $2\nu < \gamma$, that for μ sufficiently large

$$\bar{b}(\mu)\left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)^{\nu+\beta-m} \gg \mu\left(\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}\right)^{\nu+\gamma-m}, \quad m = 0,1,2,3\,. \tag{5.23}$$

To obtain a contradiction, we will make a Taylor expansion of $H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} - H_{\mathrm{TW}}$ around $\hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ and, show that for μ large, $H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ is negative somewhere. Choose $x_\mu := \hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} +$

$\mu^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ and denote $\hat{x}_\mu = \hat{x}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ for simplicity. By Taylor expansion for $\mathcal{G} := H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} - H_{\rm TW}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}(x_\mu) &= \mathcal{G}(\hat{x}_\mu) + (x_\mu - \hat{x}_\mu)\mathcal{G}'(\hat{x}_\mu) + \frac{1}{2}(x_\mu - \hat{x}_\mu)^2\mathcal{G}''(\hat{x}_\mu) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{\hat{x}_\mu}^{x_\mu} \mathcal{G}'''(t)\,(\hat{x}_\mu - t)^2\,dt. \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Using (5.5) with $x = \hat{x}_\mu$ and (5.22), (5.23), (5.21), we deduce

$$\mathcal{G}(\hat{x}_\mu) = \left(H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} - H_{\rm TW}\right)(\hat{x}_\mu) \le 0, \tag{5.25}$$

$$\mathcal{G}'(\hat{x}_\mu) = \left(H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} - H_{\rm TW}\right)'(\hat{x}_\mu) \le 0, \tag{5.26}$$

$$\mathcal{G}''(\hat{x}_\mu) = \left(H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} - H_{\rm TW}\right)''(\hat{x}_\mu) \lesssim_\varepsilon -\bar{b}(\mu)^{\frac{2-\nu}{\beta}} \le -C_1\,(\hat{x}_\mu)^{\nu-2}\,, \tag{5.27}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$ independent of μ. It remains to estimate the third derivative of $\mathcal{G}$. Since $x \le 1$, and by monotonicity in b, see Lemma 5.3 Part (ii), we write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}'''(x) = \left(H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu} - H_{\rm TW}\right)'''(x) &= (x-1)H^{1-n}_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x) + H^{1-n}_{\rm TW}(x) + \mu H^2_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x) \\ &\le H^{1-n}_{\rm TW}(x) + \mu H^2_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x) \\ &\le Cx^{\nu-3} + \mu H^2_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x)H'_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x) \\ &\le Cx^{\nu-3} + \mu H^2_{0,\mu}(x)H'_{0,\mu}(x),\end{aligned}$$

$C > 0$ is a constant not depending on μ. By (5.5), we have $\mu \mapsto \mu^{\frac{\nu-k}{\gamma}}\,\partial_x^k H_{0,\mu}\,(\hat{x}_{0,\mu})$ is bounded for μ large and $k = 0, 1, 2$. Let us choose $c_k > 0$ independent of μ such that

$$\mu^{\frac{\nu-k}{\gamma}}\,\partial_x^k H_{0,\mu}\,(\hat{x}_{0,\mu}) \le c_k,\ k = 0, 1, 2\,. \tag{5.28}$$

Since $H_{0,\mu},\ H'_{0,\mu}$ are positive increasing and using (5.28), it follows that for $0 < \hat{x}_\mu \le t \le x_\mu \le \hat{x}_{0,\mu}$,

$$\mathcal{G}'''(t) \le Ct^{\nu-3} + c_0^2\,c_1\,\mu\mu^{-\frac{2\nu}{\gamma}}\mu^{\frac{1-\nu}{\gamma}}.$$

So, we can estimate the reminder integral rest as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_{\hat{x}_\mu}^{x_\mu} \mathcal{G}'''(t)\,(\hat{x}_\mu - t)^2\,dt &\le \frac{1}{2}C\int_{\hat{x}_\mu}^{x_\mu} t^{\nu-3}\,(\hat{x}_\mu - t)^2\,dt + \frac{1}{2}c_0^2\,c_1\,\mu\mu^{-\frac{2\nu}{\gamma}}\mu^{\frac{1-\nu}{\gamma}}\int_{\hat{x}_\mu}^{x_\mu}(\hat{x}_\mu - t)^2\,dt \\ &\lesssim (x_\mu)^\nu + \mu^{-\frac{\nu}{\gamma}} \\ &\le C_0\mu^{-\nu/\gamma},\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

for some constant $C_0 > 0$ independent of μ. Here we have used

$$\hat{x}_\mu \lesssim \mu^{-1/2\nu} \ll \mu^{-1/\gamma}. \tag{5.30}$$

Plugging (5.25), (5.26), (5.27) and (5.29) in (5.24), we get

$$\mathcal{G}(x_\mu) \le C_0\mu^{-\nu/\gamma} - \frac{C_1}{2}\,(x_\mu - \hat{x}_\mu)^2\,(\hat{x}_\mu)^{\nu-2}\,. \tag{5.31}$$

Using (5.21) together with (5.30), (5.31) and the fact that

$$H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x_\mu) = \mathcal{G}(x_\mu) + H_{\mathrm{TW}}(x_\mu) = \mathcal{G}(x_\mu) + A^{-\nu/3}\,(x_\mu)^\nu\,,$$

we get

$$H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}(x_\mu) \leq C_2\mu^{-\nu/\gamma} - \frac{C_1}{2}\,(x_\mu - \hat{x}_\mu)^2\,(\hat{x}_\mu)^{\nu-2}\,,$$

where C_2 is a positive constant not depending on μ. It follows that, owing to (5.30),

$$\mu^{\frac{\nu}{\gamma}}\,(x_\mu - \hat{x}_\mu)^2\,(\hat{x}_\mu)^{\nu-2} \gtrsim \mu^{\frac{2-\nu}{2\nu(\nu+1)}} \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad \mu \to \infty,$$

since $\nu < 2$. Hence, for μ sufficiently large, $H_{\bar{b}(\mu),\mu}$ is negative somewhere, which is a contradiction. This concludes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The proof of Part (i) follows from Proposition 4.1, (5.1) and Proposition 5.2. The proof of Part (ii) follows by Proposition 5.4 with $H_{\bar{\mu}} = H_{\bar{b}(\bar{\mu}),\bar{\mu}}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

Appendix A. Existence and uniqueness for ODE

Consider the ordinary differential equation

$$y' = f(x, y) \tag{A.1}$$

where $f : E \subset \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, with E an open set. We recall the following existence and uniqueness results for (A.1).

Theorem A.1. [6, Theorem 3.1, p. 18] *If $f(x, y)$ is continuous in E and locally lipschitzian with respect to y in E, then for any $(x_0, y_0) \in E$, there exists a unique solution $y(x)$ of* (A.1) *satisfying $y(x_0) = y_0$.*

We also recall the following extension result.

Theorem A.2. [7, Theorem 3.1, p. 12] *Let $f(x, y)$ be continuous on an open set E and let $y(x)$ be a solution of* (A.1) *on some interval. Then $y(x)$ can be extended (as a solution) over a maximal interval of existence (x_*, x^*). Also, if (x_*, x^*) is a maximal interval of existence, then $y(x)$ tends to the boundary ∂E of E as $x \to x_*$ and $x \to x^*$.*

We now give the proof of Lemma 5.1.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Let $E = \mathbb{R}\times\Big((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^2\Big)$ and $f : E \to \mathbb{R}^3$ given by

$$f(x, y) = \Big(y_2,\ y_3,\ (x-1)y_1^{1-n} + \mu y_1^2 y_2\Big),\ \ y = (y_1, y_2, y_3).$$

Clearly f is continuous in E and locally lipschitzian with respect to y. The problem (5.3a)-(5.3b) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} y' &= f(x,y), \\ y(x_0) &= (U_0,U_1,U_2) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $y(x) = \Big(U(x),\, U'(x),\, U''(x)\Big)$. Using Theorems A.1-A.2, we obtain the existence of a unique maximal solution on (x_*,x^*) with $-\infty \le x_* < x_0 < x^* \le \infty$. □

Appendix B. Useful tools

In this appendix we recall some known facts for ordinary differential equations. We have the following comparison result.

Proposition B.1. *Assume that the function $y : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the ordinary differential inequality*

$$y'''(x) \ge A(x)y(x) + B(x)y'(x) + C(x)y''(x), \quad a \le x \le b, \tag{B.1}$$

where $A,\ B,\ C$ are nonnegative continuous functions.

If $y^{(k)}(a) \ge 0,\ k = 0,\ 1,\ 2$ then

$$y'''(x) \ge 0, \quad a \le x \le b. \tag{B.2}$$

To prove Proposition B.1, we need to introduce the type K function.

Definition B.1. [3, p. 27] *Let $Y = (y_1,y_2,y_3),\ Z = (z_1,z_2,z_3)$ be two vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$. We say that $Y \ge Z$, if $y_i \ge z_i,$ for all $i = 1,\ 2,\ 3$.*

Definition B.2. [3, p. 27] *A vector function $f = (f_1,f_2,f_3)$ of a vector variable $Y = (y_1,y_2,y_3)$ will be said to be of type K in a set S if for each $i = 1,\ 2,\ 3$ we have $f_i(Y) \le f_i(Z)$ for any two vectors $Y = (y_1,y_2,y_3),\ Z = (z_1,z_2,z_3)$ in S with $y_i = z_i$ and $y_j \le z_j$ $(j = 1,\ 2,\ 3;\ j \ne i)$.*

Proof of Proposition B.1. Let $Y = (y_1,y_2,y_3)$ and $f(x,Y) = (y_2,y_3,A(x)y_1 + B(x)y_2 + C(x)y_3)$. Then using Definition B.1, the differential inequality reads

$$Y'(x) \ge f(x,Y(x)),\ a \le x \le b,$$

where $Y = (y,y',y'')$. Since $A,\ B,\ C$ are nonnegative then by Definition B.2, f is type K. Using [3, Theorem 10, p. 29], and since $Y(a) \ge 0 = (0,0,0)$ we get $Y(x) = (y(x),y'(x),y''(x)) \ge (0,0,0),\ a \le x \le b$. Using the differential inequality and the fact that $A,\ B,\ C$ are nonnegative we get (B.2). This completes the proof of the proposition. □

From Proposition B.1 we deduce the following results.

Corollary B.1. *Assume that the function $y : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the ordinary differential inequality*

$$y'''(x) > A(x)y(x) + B(x)y'(x) + C(x)y''(x), \quad a \le x \le b, \tag{B.3}$$

where A, B, C are positive continuous functions.

If $y^{(k)}(a) > 0$, $k = 0, 1, 2$ then

$$y'''(x) > 0, \quad a \le x \le b. \tag{B.4}$$

Proof of Corollary B.1. Using Proposition B.1, we deduce that $y^{(k)}(x) \ge 0$, $a \le x \le b$, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Then the desired inequality (B.4) follows immediately from (B.3). □

Corollary B.2. *Assume that the function $y : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the ordinary differential equation*

$$y'''(x) = A(x)y(x) + B(x)y'(x) + C(x)y''(x), \quad a \le x \le b, \tag{B.5}$$

where A, B, C are positive continuous functions. If $y^{(k)}(a) < 0$, $k = 0, 1, 2$ then

$$y'''(x) \le 0, \quad a \le x \le b. \tag{B.6}$$

Proof of Corollary B.2. Put $z = -y$. Then z satisfies the assumptions in Proposition B.1. Hence we obtain (B.6). □

3. Conclusions

We consider self-similar source-type solutions H for the thin-film equation with a regularizing second order term and with mobility exponent $n \in (\frac{3}{2}, 3)$ in dimension one. We show the existence of a solution having the behavior: $H(x) = H_{\mathrm{TW}}(x)\left(1 + v(x, x^\beta, x^\gamma)\right)$, where H_{TW} is the travelling wave, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma = 2 + \frac{6}{n}$, and $v(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is analytic near $(0, 0, 0)$ with $v(0, 0, 0) = 0$, $\partial_2 v(0, 0, 0) < 0$. This improves the previously published results ([1]) about qualitative behavior of the solution nearby the interface. The previous asymptotic shows that the source-type solution for the thin film equations with gravity is an analytic function in the three spacial variables (x_1, x_2, x_3) where $x_2 := x^\beta$ and $x_3 := x^\gamma$. The third variable is new, unless $n = 2$, with respect to the known expansion for the standard thin film equation.

This shows the effect of the gravity on the expansion of source type solutions. We expect this to be the generic behavior of solutions of the thin film equation with gravity (1.1a) and to be helpful for the well-posedness for (1.1a). In fact, it is shown in [5] that the expansion, given in [4], of the source type solution for the standard thin film equation (1.2) has an effect on the behavior of the solutions. Also, this expansion was useful in [5] to obtain a well-posedness result for (1.2).

Acknowledgements

The authors are much obliged to M. V. Gnann and N. Masmoudi for interesting discussions.

References

[1] Beretta, E., *Selfsimilar source solutions of a fourth order degenerate parabolic equation*, Nonlinear Anal. 29 (1997), 741-760.

[2] Bernis, F.; Peletier, L. A. and Williams, S. M., *Source type solutions of a fourth order nonlinear degenerate parabolic equation*, Nonlinear Anal. 18 (1992), 217-234.

[3] Coppel, W.-A., *Stability and asymptotic behavior of differential equations*, D. C. Heath and Co., Boston, Mass., 1965.

[4] Giacomelli, L., Gnann, M. V. and Otto, F., *Regularity of source-type solutions to the thin-film equation with zero contact angle and mobility exponent between* 3/2 *and* 3, European J. Appl. Math. 24 (2013), 735–760.

[5] Giacomelli, L., Gnann, M. V., Knüpfer, H. and Otto, F., *Well-posedness for the Navier-slip thin-film equation in the case of complete wetting*, J. Differential Equations, 257 (2014), 15–81.

[6] Hale, Jack K., *Ordinary differential equations*, Second edition, Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., Inc., Huntington, N.Y., (1980).

[7] Hartman, P., *Ordinary differential equations*, *Classics in Applied Mathematics*, Vol. **38**, Corrected reprint of the second (1982) edition, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 2002.

[8] Slepčev, D. and Pugh, M. C., *Selfsimilar blowup of unstable thin-film equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., Vol. **54** (2005), 1697–1738.

[9] Witelski, T. P. and Bernoff, A. J. and Bertozzi, A. L., *Blowup and dissipation in a critical-case unstable thin film equation*, European J. Appl. Math., Vol. **15** (2004), 223–256.

Mohamed Majdoub
Université de Tunis El Manar, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, Département de Mathématiques, Laboratoire équations aux dérivées partielles (LR03ES04), 2092 Tunis, Tunisie
e-mail: mohamed.majdoub@fst.rnu.tn

Slim Tayachi
Université de Tunis El Manar, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, Département de Mathématiques, Laboratoire équations aux dérivées partielles (LR03ES04), 2092 Tunis, Tunisie
e-mail: slim.tayachi@fst.rnu.tn